

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 56/TT/2017

- Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff for Asset-I: 400 kV D/C (Quard) Dehradun-Abdullahpur transmission line alongwith associated bays at Dehradun and Abdullahpur Sub-station and Asset-II: 400 kV D/C (Quard) Dulhasti-Kishenpur-single circuit strung alongwith associated bays at kishenpur end under “Northern Region Strengthening Scheme – XXIV”
- Date of Hearing** : 28.8.2018
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri A. K. Singhal, Member
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL)
- Respondents** : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. (RRVPL) and 16 others
- Parties present** : Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri V. P. Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL
Shri Pankaj Sharma, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the schedule COD of the instant assets was 20.11.2014. He submitted that first circuit of the Dehradun-Abdullahpur line was put into commercial operation on 31.3.2018 and circuit 2 on 1.4.2018. He further submitted that the petitioner has to pay annuity charges and requested to allow the same as part of the tariff.



2. The learned counsel for BRPL and BYPL submitted that the reasons given by the petitioner for cost over-run are similar in all the petitions and the petitioner should be directed to give the specific reasons for the cost over-run. He submitted that delay due to RoW issues in the instant case is attributable to the petitioner and the petitioner having vast experience in the execution of transmission systems should have taken care of this issue at the stage of planning of the instant assets. He further submitted that the TSA filed by the petitioner is not in accordance with the Regulation 3(63) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. He further submitted that PERT chart should have been given on the basis of the actual COD and it does not show the time taken for getting the forest clearance and to resolve the RoW issues.

3. The Commission observed that the petitioner should give the specific reasons for cost variation and the PERT chart should clearly state the time envisaged for the different stage of execution of the transmission system and the actual time taken in all future cases.

4. After hearing the parties, the Commission reserved the order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief (Law)

